

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

M2 CONSULTING, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

C.A. No. 03-12589-GAO

MRO SOFTWARE, INC.

Defendant.

**MRO SOFTWARE, INC.’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY BRIEF  
IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SERVE ADDITIONAL  
INTERROGATORIES AND DOCUMENT REQUESTS, AND FOR SANCTIONS**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Local Rule 7.1(B)(3), Defendant/Plaintiff-in-Counterclaim MRO Software, Inc. (“MRO”) respectfully moves for leave to file the Reply Memorandum submitted herewith in support of its Motion for Leave to Serve Additional Interrogatories and Document Requests and for Sanction (the “Motion”), and in Response to M2 Consulting, Inc.’s (“M2”) Opposition to MRO’s Motion (the “Opposition”). A copy of MRO’s Reply Memorandum (“Reply Memo”) is attached as Exhibit A.

M2’s Opposition makes a number of false and misleading representations to the Court. MRO requests leave to file its Reply Memo to address these matters. Allowing this motion is in the interests of justice and efficiency since it will permit MRO to correct certain inaccurate and deceptive statements made in M2’s Opposition and to assist the Court in simplifying and understanding MRO’s Motion.

Accordingly, this motion should be allowed and MRO’s Reply Memo attached as Exhibit A should be filed with the Court.

MRO SOFTWARE, INC.

By its attorneys,

/s/ Kurt Bratten

Lee T. Gesmer (BBO No. 190260)

Kurt Bratten (BBO No. 644730)

Gesmer Updegrove LLP

40 Broad Street

Boston, MA 02109

Kurt.Bratten@gesmer.com

(617) 350-6800

Dated: July 5, 2005

### **Local Rule 7.1 Certificate of Compliance**

Counsel for the Defendant hereby certifies that, pursuant to Rule 7.1(A)(2) of the Local Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, he (1) has conferred with counsel for the Plaintiff regarding the attached Motion, and (2) has attempted in good faith to resolve or narrow the issues presented.

/s/ Kurt Bratten

Kurt Bratten